IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.20496 of 2000

Between:

1 Anmala Symala, W/o Pedda Gangiah,
R/o Chinamalla Reddy Village, Kamareddy Mandal,
Nizamabad District.
2 Anmala Pedda Gangiah, S/o Baliah,
R/o Chinamalla Reddy Village, Komareddy Mandal,
Nizamabad District.
3 Meesala Jayamma, W/o Bal Reddy,
R/o Chinamalla Reddy Village, Kamareddy Mandal,
Nizamabad District.
4 Meesala Bal Reddy, S/o Sai Reddy,
R/o Chinamalla Reddy Village, Kamareddy Mandal,
Nizamabad District.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 Sub Inspector of Police, Devanpally Police Station,
Nizamabad District.
2 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Kamareddy Mandal,
Nizamabad District.
3 Elka Bhim Reddy, S/o Rajiah, R/o Chinamalla Reddy Village,

Kamareddy Mandal, Nizamabad District.
4 Elka Raj Reddy, S/o Malla Reddy, R/o Chinamalla Reddy Village,

Kamareddy Mandal, Nizamabad District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the

circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, order or direction, particularly one in the nature of Mandamus, declaring F.I.R.No.86 of 2000 dt.26.9.2000 on the file the 1st respondent herein registered on the complaint of the 2nd respondent herein as illegal, arbitrary, abuse of process of court and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and issue a consequential direction to the 1st respondent herein not to give effect to the same.

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR.M.RAJAMALLA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2: GP FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.3 and 4: MR.S.KRISHNA

The Court made the following:

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

The petitioners 2 and 4 are accused in Crime No.86 of 2000 of P.S. Devanpally, Nizamabad District. They filed the writ petition for quashing the said crime on the ground that the complaint does not disclose any offence and if the investigation is allowed to be continued, it would cause hardship to the petitioners and would result in miscarriage of justice.

The complaint was lodged by the Superintendent of the Office of the Mandal Revenue Officer, Kamareddy. In the complaint, it is alleged that the petitioners 2 and 4 produced forged sale deeds executed in the name of the petitioners 1 and 3 in relation to the land admeasuring Acs.7.36 gts. in Survey Nos.124/AA and 125/A situated at Patharajampet village and therefore, the Superintendent requested to register crime. Based on the said complaint, the first respondent registered the Crime No.86 of 2000 under Sections 420, 468 and 471 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC).

It appears that there is a dispute regarding the said land, between the petitioners 2 and 4 on one side and respondents 3 and 4 on the other side. The same is pressed into service as a ground for quashing. This Court is not able to countenance the submission. A reading of the F.I.R. would disclose that in connection with a transaction before the public authority, the petitioners 2 and 4 produced forged documents and that itself would be sufficient to attract the offence under Section 420 of IPC. If the petitioners have any defence, it is up to them to raise the same before the criminal Court. There are no strong grounds to quash the F.I.R.

The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

_____

July 19, 2005. (**V.V.S.RAO,J**)

YS

To

1 The Sub Inspector of Police, Devanpally Police Station,
Nizamabad District.
2 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Kamareddy Mandal,
Nizamabad District.
3 Two CCs to the Government Pleader for Home,

High Court Buildings, Hyderabad. (OUT)

4 Two C.D. Copies.